

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action mailed January 25, 2008, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Entry of the present amendment and allowance of the present application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

By means of the present amendment, claims 1 and 13 have been amended to correct a typographical error.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 7, 11 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,938,606 (Bonnefous-606) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,579,771 (Bonnefous-771). Claims 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bonnefous-606 in view of Bonnefous-771 and U.S. Patent No. 6,508,768 (Hall). Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bonnefous-606 in view of Bonnefous-771 and U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0031921 (Bonnefous-921). Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bonnefous-606 in view of Bonnefous-771 and Hall. Claims 15-16 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0039382 (Bonnefous-382). Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bonnefous-382 in view of and Hall. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7 and 9-17 are patentable over Bonnefous-606, Hall, Bonnefous-771, Bonnefous-921 and Bonnefous-382 for at least the following reasons.

On page 3 of the Final Office Action, column 5, line 51 to column 6, line 30 and claim 5 of Bonnefous-771 are cited in an attempt to allegedly show visualizing the images together with parameters that include the distensibility being a ratio of dilation by a diameter of the artery, as recited in independent claims 1 and 13. Further, on page 8 of the Final Office Action, paragraphs [0054] to [0056] of Bonnefous-382 are cited in an attempt to allegedly show a similar feature recited in independent claim 15.

It is respectfully submitted that a careful reading of column 5, line 51 to column 6, line 30 and claim 5 of Bonnefous-771 indicates a disclosure related to temporal integration and a discussion of healthy and damaged arteries. For example, the

linear relationship between variation of the diameter of the artier and pressure is noted and equations provided relating flow rate and pressure in an elastic tube.

Further, a careful reading of paragraphs [0054] to [0056] of Bonnefous-382 reveals that the noted paragraphs describe determining the starting points of a cardiac cycle by analyzing temporal variation of the mean arterial dilation and representing dilation curves in relation to the starting points.

It is respectfully submitted that the noted sections of Bonnefous-771 and Bonnefous-382 are completely silent and do not teach or suggest "viewing means for visualizing the images together with parameters that include the distensibility being a ratio of dilation by a diameter of the artery," (emphasis added) as recited in amended independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 13 and 15.

Assuming, arguendo, that Bonnefous-771 and Bonnefous-382 do disclose calculating distensibility as a ratio of dilation by a diameter of the artery, there is still no teaching or suggest of visualizing the images together with the distensibility, as recited in independent claims 1, 13 and 15.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that independent claims 1, 13 and 15 be allowed. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-7, 9-12, 14 and 16-17 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 15 as well as their individually patentable elements.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
March 3, 2008

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101